

SECRET

IPC Equipment

Approved For Release 2002/06/28 : CIA-RDP78-04723A000100060031-6

28 MAY 1970

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, Information Processing Staff/OPPB

SUBJECT : Draft "Policy Considerations Governing Acquisition
and Installation of Remote Terminal Equipment"
dated 24 April 1970

1. We are beginning to accumulate a substantial number of memorandums governing information processing activities and equipment. We have the Director's memorandum of 3 September 1969 and two memorandums from the Executive Director Comptroller issued in October 1969 and April 1970. The draft which is the subject of this memorandum is one of two more being circulated for coordination. It seems unlikely that this will be the end of it. I suggest that the Information Processing Staff develop draft Agency regulations to incorporate the policies already issued in memorandums and that subsequent issuances be prepared in the same way. The Regulations Control Branch of the Support Services Staff will be glad to assist in developing the format and editorial style.


2. The 24 April draft policy statement about remote terminals should be reconsidered in terms of the memorandum issued by the Executive Director Comptroller 13 October 1969. We should be looking for guidelines governing the review of problems and applications before the solutions have been selected rather than wait until a decision has been made to install a remote terminal.

3. The following comments are keyed to paragraphs of the draft paper:

a. para. 1 - The need to plan for the installation of remote terminals is clear, but the Technical Facilities Committee is working hard on this problem. It seems to me the policy should be directed toward "the growing Agency requirements for interactive services." What kinds of applications really require interactive service and how do we make that judgment? With regard to the footnote defining a remote terminal, I wonder why we are less interested in terminals inside a computer center than those located outside. I do not see why location should be substituted for the need to consider and judge the reasonableness of the purposes they are to serve.

Approved For Release 2002/06/28 : CIA-RDP78-04723A000100060031-6

SECRET



b. para 1a - What constitutes a "clear requirement"? Don't we need some criteria to help ensure that the clarity of the requirement is the same for one application as it is for another?

c. para 1a(1) - Clocking the use obviously can only be done after the terminal has been installed. It cannot be used in judging the need for the acquisition. Clocking the use and weighing it against estimated use, 1a(2), is worthwhile only if it is intended that some action be taken if use falls below some standard or norm. These provisions can only be meaningful if there is a guideline of some sort against which estimated use can be measured in justifying the acquisition in the first place. If we don't have a general guideline each user will develop his own and it will be extremely difficult to maintain a balance.

d. para 1a(3) - We should be concerned with the "indispensability" of the function before we concern ourselves with the question of whether or not a terminal represents the best or only solution to a particular problem. We should address ourselves to the problems and whether they are worth solving first and to the method of solution after that. Then we need some method of testing the validity of the justification for the solution chosen. What is a "stand-alone" terminal? Wouldn't "dedicated" or "individual" be a better term?

e. para 1a(4) - What is meant by "strictness"? How strict is strict? Who evaluates strictness? If strictness is to be evaluated in the Directorate, as I believe it should be, it seems to me we will need some way of ensuring that one Directorate is neither more nor less liberal than another. With regard to the tentative plans for 600 devices, I believe everyone acknowledges that this is only a number. The key question is whether the requirements are valid. Presumably we would have to plan for 1200 if there were 1200 valid requirements.

f. para 1b - The term "remote service center" is introduced in 1a(3) without any preliminaries and 1b does nothing to clarify the term. In any case, whether there is a requirement for a "stand alone" terminal or the need can be met by co-locating several terminals is a system consideration. A policy paper of this kind should not place arbitrary constraints on system design. If there is a real justification for prescribing such system constraints we should have some criteria to use in judging when a service center is more desirable than a separate terminal.

SECRET

Approved For Release 2002/06/28 : CIA-RDP78-04723A000100060031-6

g. para 1d - Have we firmly established the requirements for equipping computer centers with a switching capability? How extensive is the requirement? Shouldn't it be subjected to the same scrutiny this paper would require for remote terminals? I wonder whether such a prescription is consistent with the overall intent of a policy paper such as this. If a study is to be conducted I wonder whether it shouldn't address the questions raised above rather than start seeking an optimum design, assuming there is such a thing given the differences among the computer centers. In any case, this paper shouldn't say a study should be conducted unless it can also say who is going to do it.

h. para 1e - This seems to re-open the SIDS question which is being dealt with by DD/S and the Technical Facilities Committee. It doesn't belong here. If something must be said, I would urge a more general statement such as "Equipment acquisition will conform to such standards for computer and communications interface as may be adopted."

i. para 2 - If the principles of the memorandum issued by the Executive Director last October are applied, the need for a remote terminal will be well established before the decision is reached to acquire one, and the coordination among all interested parties will have been accomplished before installation plans have become final. The role of the Board and the Technical Facilities Committee is set forth adequately in the October memorandum.

/s/



Chief, Support Services Staff

25X1A


DDS/SSS/RHW:skd (28 May 1970)

Distribution:

- Orig - Addressee
- 1 - DD/S
- 1 - SSS Subject
- 1 - SSS Chrono

Approved For Release 2002/06/28 : CIA-RDP78-04723A000100060031-6

SECRET



25X1

Approved For Release 2002/06/28 : CIA-RDP78-04723A000100060031-6

Next 6 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2002/06/28 : CIA-RDP78-04723A000100060031-6